<center>**REMARKS**</center>

Claims 1, 2, 16, 22, 29, 30, 39, 40, and 46 have been amended and claims 9, 26, 35 and 50 have been canceled. Claims 1-8, 10-25, 27-34, 36-49 and 51-52 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Art Unit Assignment

It is noted that the present application is being examined in art unit 3622, which is the art unit for incentive programs and coupons. However, the present invention does not pertain to incentive programs or coupons. The present application should be examined in one of the 2140 or 2150 art units on computer networks and plural computers, or perhaps 2194 on interprogram/interprocess communications. Applicants request transfer of this application to a more appropriate art unit for examination.

Request for Information Under Rule 105:

The Examiner has requested that Applicants "indicate which claims (if any) are *entirely* supported by application(s) filed prior to the filing date of this case."

Applicants submit that all of the claims are fully and entirely supported in the oldest provision application (Ser. No. 60/202,975) to which the instant application claims priority and therefore the supported filing date is, as indicated in the priority information section of the instant application, May 9, 2000.

For example, claim 1 is entirely supported by the 60/202,975 application. See, e.g., FIGs. 8, 12, 14, 15, 42-47; page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12; page 26, lines 4-9; page 26, line 21 – page 27, line 2; page 30, line 9 – line 32, line 8; and page 31, line 27 – page 33, line 28of the 60/202,975 application. Thus, independent claim 1 is entirely supported by the 60/202,975 application.

Similarly, independent claims 16, 29 and 40 are also entirely supported by the 60/202,975 application. See, e.g., page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12; page 26, lines 4-9; page 26, line 21 – page 27, line 2; page 30, line 9 – page 33, line 28.

Additionally, the dependent claims are also entirely supported by the 60/202,975 application. For example, dependent claims 2 – 15 are fully supported by the 60/202,975 application, as indicated below:

Claim 2: *see, e.g.*, page 32, line 24 – page 33, line 7; page 21, lines 5 – 22; and page 30, line 9 – page 32, line 8. Claim 3: *see, e.g.*, page 22, line 15 – page 23, line 12; page 24, line 13 – page 25, line 15. Claim 4: *see, e.g.*, page 22, line 15 – page 23, line 12; page 24, line 13 – page 25, line 15. Claim 5: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 22, line 5. Claim 6: *see, e.g.*, page 34, lines 1 – 10. Claim 7: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12; page 26, lines 4-9; page 26, line 21 – page 27, line 2; page 30, line 9 – line 32, line 8; page 34, lines 1 – 10. Claim 8: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12. Claim 9: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12. Claim 10: *see, e.g.*, page 32, lines 1 – 8. Claim 11: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12. Claim 12: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12; page 26, line 21 – page 27, line 2; page 30, line 9 – line 32, line 8. Claim 13: *see, e.g.*, page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12; page 31, line 27 – page 33, line 28. Claim 14: *see, e.g.*, page 17, lines 10-22; page 18, line 19 – page 19, line 6; page 20, lines 1-12; page 20, line 29 – page 21, line 3. Claim 15: *see, e.g.*, page 18, line 19 – page 19, line 6.

Similarly dependent claims 17- 28, 30-39 and 41 – 52 are also entirely supported by the 60/202,975 application. For example, see, e.g., page 17, lines 10-22; page 18, line 19 – page 19, line 6; page 20, lines 1-12; page 21, line 5 – page 23, line 12; page 24, line 13 – page 25, line 15; page 26, lines 4-9; page 26, line 21 – page 27, line 2; page 30, line 9 – page 32, line 8; page 31, line 27 – page 33, line 28; and page 34, lines 1 – 10.

As shown above, all of the claims of the instant application are entirely supported by the earliest provisional application to which the instant application claims priority. Thus, the earliest supported filing date of all claims is May 9, 2000.

The Examiner also stated that the "Jini technology which although described as having limitations desired to be overcome, appears to read on most if not all of the present claims." Applicants respectfully traverse this statement. The prior art Jini technology does not describe Applicants' claimed invention as recited in the independent claims.

The Examiner requested that Applicants "disclose to the examiner the state of any Jini technology (or Jini precursors) that existed at the time of 1 year prior to [Applicants'] earliest benefit date(s)." Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to: IDS reference no. B53 - Venners, "Jini Technology, Out of the Box," JAVAWORLD, 'Online!, pp. 1-4, December 1998; IDS reference no. F7 - Ken Arnold, "The Jini ^{tm} Architecture: Dynamic Services in a Flexible Network," ACM 1-58113-109-7/99, June 1999; and to "Sun uncorks Jini, names partners", http://news.com.com/2100-1001-220610.html.

The above response to the Examiner's Rule 105 requests reflects current knowledge and readily available information. Any requested information not addressed by the above response is either unknown or not readily available.

Claim objections:

The Examiner objected to claim 39 because of informalities. Claim 39 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to overcome this objection.

Section 101 Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-21, 26-29, 35-45 and 50-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants' respectfully traverse this rejection. However, to further prosecution of the instant application, claims 1, 16, 29 and 40 have been amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Section 102(a/b) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-18, 20-24, 26-32, 35-42, 44-48 and 50-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a and/or b) as being anticipated by cswl.com-upnp-devices ("UpnP, Jini and Salutation…") (hereinafter "cswl.com"). Applicants respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reasons presented above.

Regarding claim 1, contrary to the Examiner's contention, cswl.com does not disclose that each space advertisement includes information for accessing a corresponding space, where the information for accessing the corresponding space comprises an address for sending messages to the space to access the space and a data representation language message schema defining the messages in a data representation language. The Examiner relies, regarding claim 9, on the Simple Service Discovery Protocol (SSDP) of Universal Plug and Play (UPnP) described in cswl.com. Cswl.com teaches that a device joining a network sends out an ANNOUNCE message, "telling the world about itself." The ANNOUNCE message contains a "URI that defines the resource … and a URI to an XML file that provides a description of the announcing device." However, cwsl.com fails to teach a data representation language schema defining messages in a data representation language included in information for accessing the space.

Instead, cswl.com teaches, "[o]nce the discovery process is through and the XML descriptions of a device is received, proprietary protocols can take over in communicating with the devices" (page 6, 3rd paragraph). For example, cswl.com teaches, regarding invoking services, sending a page to a HP or Jujitsu printer "would still need drivers (unless both [printers] support a [proprietary] protocol like the HP JetSend protocol)" (page 6, "Invoking Services", parenthesis in original). Thus, rather

than teach that information for accessing the corresponding space comprises an address for sending messages to the space to access the space and *a data representation language message schema defining the messages in a data representation language* cswl.com teaches the use of proprietary protocols and device-specific drivers.

Without some specific teaching in cswl.com regarding a data representation language message schema defining messages in a data representation language for accessing the corresponding space, the Examiner is merely speculating impermissibly regarding the teachings of cswl.com. Thus, as noted above, the Examiner's cited art fails to disclose all the limitations of, and therefore does not anticipate (e.g., a rejection under §102), Applicants' claim. The rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 16, 29 and 40.

Regarding claim 4, cswl.com fails to disclose wherein the **messages are defined according to a data representation language schema in the selected space advertisement**. The Examiner does not cite any portion of cited in the rejection of claim 4. Instead, the Examiner merely states, "the advertisement/notification of the uniquely formed/formatted address for the space provides information for sending messages [to] and accessing … the space." However, whether or not a uniquely formed and/or formatted address, which the Examiner equates to the advertisement of Applicants' claim does not have anything to do with messages defined according to a data representation language schema *in the selected space advertisement*. Following the Examiner's logic, the network address would have to include a data representation language schema defining messages. Such is clearly not the case in cswl.com.

Furthermore, as discussed above regarding claim 1, cswl.com fails to teach a data representation language schema defining messages. Moreover, cswl.com does not describe a data representation language schema in the selected space advertisement. The Examiner equates the UPnP XML service description file taught by cswl.com with the

space advertisement of Applicants' claim. However, as noted above regarding claim 1, cswl.com does not mention anything about the XML service description file including a data representation language schema according to which messages are defined.

Without some specific teaching in cswl.com regarding messages defined according to a data representation language schema in a space advertisement, cswl.com cannot be said to anticipate Applicants' claim. Thus, the rejection of claim 4 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claims 24, 32 and 48.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over cswl.com, claims 5, 19, 25, 33, 43 and 49 as being unpatentable over cswl.com in view of ssdp-v1-03 ("Simple Service Discovery…") (hereinafter "ssdp"). Applicants respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims for at least the reasons presented above regarding their respective independent claims.

Regarding both the §102 and §103 rejections above, Applicants also assert that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-65000/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: ___April 30, 2007___